



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A FEW NOTES ON OLD FRENCH PHONOLOGY.

THESE notes are suggested by and are put in the form of comments on the third edition of Paris's 'Extraits de la Chanson de Roland.' It is unnecessary for me to say anything in praise of this book, and it is pretty certain that some, at least, of the matters I speak of in the following lines, have intentionally been left unmentioned by the author. It is precisely because the book already does so much for the beginner in helping him to realize what he is very apt not to realize, namely, that sounds are not the same thing as the letters used to represent them, that I bring forward these considerations. It seems to me they concern points where the bright student needs help with the questions he will be likely to ask. It should be added that I have in view the needs of American students particularly, and that I do not confine my remarks to the changes made in the third edition. P. xxxvi. The *j* at the end of the table of consonant signs used in the 'Observations grammaticales' has the dot; of course a misprint. P. 3. It is not quite clear to me why Paris does not include here *iu* as one of the diphthongs (§4); from the language used "Les autres groupes de voyelles contiguës forment toujours deux syllabes," it would be inferred that he considers the form *siut*=*sequit*, mentioned in §102, p. 44, as having two syllables, which I cannot believe. Pp. 6, 7, §§12, 17. One would like to see either less detail or more; as stated here the rules for *é* and *è* in unaccented syllables are apt to perplex and confuse rather than to help. Both are said to come "à l'atone" from "ȝ, ȝ, ȝ entravés," though these are not the only sources mentioned. From the analogy of §22 one would expect a different rule for the *e* (cf. however §10). The subject is too difficult for any but the clearest statements to be desirable. If a brief statement is to be made, would it not be well to say that the exact determination of *é* and *è* in unaccented syllables in the language of the 'Roland' is not possible? P. 11, §32. It is a pleasure to see the new signs for the *t* and *d* which later disappear and the account given of their values (§45), but if these two consonants are recognized for the period concerned, ought not one more consonant to

be added which French has since lost? Suchier has it in his table (Gröber's 'Grundriss,' p. 585, as well as *ʒ* and *ð*=Paris's dotted *t*, *d*); he marks it *ȝ*. It is the sound of *n* before a *g* or *k* sound, written *ng* in English *hang*, *sung*, and occurring in English in a number of words from Old French (*anguish*, *rank*, *uncle*), and according to the statements in §§53, 54 for *m* and *n* it would seem that Paris ought to recognize this value for the first *n* in *sanglent*; the same value which Latin *n* had in a similar position. I make no strong objection to the lack of any mention of palatalized consonants (the *d* of *aidier*, the *s* of *laisser*, etc.), for perhaps the author considered that such mention would embarrass the learner more than it would help him, or he may have had other good reasons for silence. English words like *finish*, *leash*, etc., might be brought forward in considerable numbers to show that the palatal *s* (*s'*) or some sound developed from it existed in Old French. Are the cases where English has an *s* sound for a theoretical Old French palatal *s*, to be explained sometimes as later borrowings when *s'* had become simply *s* in French, and has the spelling sometimes caused *s* to be the sound in English instead of *ʃ*? I incline to the opinion as the result of a still incomplete study, that, with due allowance for disturbing factors, the English forms will be found to corroborate the view that a palatal *s* existed in Old French. I know of no evidence for Behrens's and ten Brink's theoretical Old French *stʃ*, *sʃ* in the history of *angoisse* from *angustia* (see *Franz. Studien*, v, 189, ten Brink, "Chaucers Sprache und Verskunst," p. 75, and recently Behrens, in Paul's 'Grundriss der germ. Philologie' i, p. 835), and it seems to me improbable that it ever existed there. I think a palatal *s* can explain the *-iss-* in *angoisse*, and some cases at least of Italian *sci*(=*ʃ*). The combination *stʃ* we may assume as the early value of *sch* in O. Fr. *sche*=Lat. *sca*; for example (*pescheor*=*piscatorem*), but here it later becomes *ʃ*, not *iss*.—To return to Paris's 'Extraits,' it does seem to me that §91 might, with the assumption of palatalized consonants, be put in a way which would be easier for the student to understand and remember. P. 14, §43. The value of *qu* is an interesting question; if in the Old French brought over into Eng-

land the combinations *qui* and *que* always meant *ki*, *ke*, it would seem that our modern pronunciations in *quit*, *quest*, etc. (cf. *conquer* with *k* by the side of *conquest* with *kw*) are due to the influence of the spelling, even in words so popular as *quit*, *quits*, *quite*. There is no doubt of this in some cases (cf. *equip*). But in learned or semi-learned words may not the *qu* have been pronounced in O. Fr. with the traditional value of *qu*, that is, with consonantal *u* (or *i*) when *e* or *i* followed? Cf. O. Fr. *qui* for *cui*, and the occasional spelling with *cu* in Middle English in some cases. In the last sentence of § 43, I should translate "sans doute" to students by some such word as "perhaps"; there is no phonetic difficulty about *kw* and *gw* before *e* and *i*. P. 18, § 48. A few remarks on the phonetic value of the *z* here spoken of (*otre-ier* from *auct'rizare*, not *auct'ricare* as before; see the glossary), and the way it becomes *y* (Paris's undotted *j*) would have been welcome, and would help the understanding of § 91. Cf. Meyer-Lübke, 'Gramm. der roman. Sprachen,' § 17, p. 34 (O. Fr. *batoyer*=*baptizare*, and the rest of the paragraph on Greek ζ), also Schuchardt in the *Literaturblatt* v, 62. Would not the assumed value *dz* for the Greek letter explain everything? This might have become either identical with *dy* or else confused with it, perhaps through an intermediate form *dž*. Whether the earlier Latin *ss* for Greek ζ had at first a phonetic value (*zz*?) depending on a popular imitation of *dz* I will not here discuss, though that does not seem to me at all impossible. Cf. also the remarks on *z* in Gröber's 'Grundriss,' pp. 448, 584-586. The value of the *z* in Old and Modern French comes up again in connection with § 56, p. 21. If we compare the *z*=*ts* after "*n* appuyée (*anz*)" mentioned in this paragraph, we shall perhaps think there is some reason for giving the *z* in *quinze* at least the value of *dz* rather than of "*s* douce," especially if we reflect that *z* in Old French meaning *ts* has that value when its position corresponds to that in which *d* (for example) becomes *t*; so that the traditional value *dz* would most naturally be assumed for it when the voiced pronunciation raises no difficulty. The sound *z* was in Old French usually represented by *s*, as Paris says in § 46. One can

hardly help thinking of the two values of *z* in Italian, and supposing that the French value is not unconnected historically with one or both of the Italian meanings of the sign (of which I assume *dz* as the proper traditional one, the use for *ts* being later and not unnatural). In that case, too, we can easily understand how *z* in later French (and hence in English) spelling has the value of voiced *s*; it has lost the *d* of the older value *dz*, just as O. Fr. *c* when =*ts* now means *s*, and as Old French *j* and *g* (before *e*, *i*) now means *ž*, instead of *dž* as formerly. Of course we do not need to assume that O. Fr. *z* meant *dz* in any cases in order to explain its modern value. I only mean that the modern value is not inconsistent with an earlier value *dz* in certain cases. If O. Fr. *z* had two values and one was *ts*, then the other seems to me more likely to have been *dz* than *z* in the eleventh century. P. 29, § 71. The masculine numeral 'two' is apparently omitted by mistake. P. 35, last line of § 87, the addition of words like "except those in *-jan*" would perhaps help the beginner. P. 36, § 91. It is not clear why *s*, *l*, *n*, when preceded by a palatal, are not mentioned at the beginning of the paragraph where the statement seems intended to be complete.

E. S. SHELDON.

Harvard University.

HERMANN UND DOROTHEA.

Hermann und Dorothea von Goethe: Edited with Introduction and Notes by CALVIN THOMAS, Professor of Germanic Languages and Literature in the University of Michigan. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1891. xxii, 004.

Goethe's Hermann und Dorothea edited with an Introduction and Notes by W. T. HEWETT, Professor of the German Language and Literature in Cornell University. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1891. 1, 233.

HERE we have two American editions of a work of Goethe, of which we had already one excellent edition by Professor J. M. Hart, published by the Putnams, and a cheap one published by the Holts. Many of us would have been content to wait for these new editions